arXiv:1011.3100v2 [math.PR] 24 Feb 2012

LOCAL LIMIT THEOREMS VIA LANDAU-KOLMOGOROV INEQUALITIES

Adrian Röllin and Nathan Ross

National University of Singapore, University of California at Berkeley

Abstract

In this article we use Landau-Kolmogorov inequalities to obtain new inequalities between some common probability metrics. We illustrate the use of these inequalities by providing rates of convergencce in novel local limit theorems for the magnetization in the Curie-Weiss model at high temperature, the number of triangles and isolated vertices in Erdős-Rényi random graphs, as well as the independence number in a geometric random graph. We also obtain new rates of convergence in other probability metrics for some of these examples.

Keywords: Landau-Kolmogorov inequalities; Kolmogorov metric; Wasserstein metric; local limit metric; total variation metric; Erdős-Rényi random graph; Curie-Weiss Model

1 INTRODUCTION

The classical Landau inequality (see Hardy, Landau, and Littlewood (1935, Section 3)) relates the norm of a function with that of its first and second derivatives. There are many extensions and embellishments of this inequality in the analysis literature; see Kwong and Zettl (1992) for a book length treatment. The following theorem is a discrete version of such inequalities. For a function f with domain the integers, denote for $1 \leqslant p < \infty$,

$$\|f\|_p = \left(\sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} |f(i)|^p \right)^{1/p},$$

and $\|f\|_\infty = \sup_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} |f(i)|$, and also define the operators Δ^n recursively by

$$\Delta^0 f(k) = f(k) \text{ and } \quad \Delta^{n+1} f(k) = \Delta^n f(k+1) - \Delta^n f(k).$$

Theorem 1.1 (Kwong and Zettl (1992, Theorem 4.1))**.** *Let k and n be integers with $1 \leqslant k < n$ and let $1 \leqslant p, q, r \leqslant \infty$ given. There is a positive number C such that*

$$\|\Delta^k f\|_q \leqslant C \, \|f\|_p^{1-\beta} \, \|\Delta^n f\|_r^{\beta}$$

for all $f : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{R}$ with $\|f\|_p < \infty$ and $\|\Delta^n f\|_r < \infty$, where

$$\beta = \frac{k - 1/q + 1/p}{n - 1/r + 1/p},$$

if and only if

$$\frac{n}{q} \leqslant \frac{n-k}{p} + \frac{k}{r}.$$

Remark 1.1. Much of the literature surrounding these so-called Landau-Kolmogorov inequalities is concerned with finding the optimal value of the constant C. In the case that $n = 2$ and either $p = q = r = 1$, or $n = 3$, $p = q = \infty$, and $r = 1$, we can take $C = \sqrt{2}$; see Kwong and Zettl (1992, Theorem 4.2). These are two of the main cases discussed below. Also, an inductive argument in n implies that in the former case above we may take $C = 2^{(n-1)/2}$ for $n \geqslant 2$ and in the latter $C = 2^{(n-2)/2}$ for $n \geqslant 3$. These facts are not critical in what follows, so for the sake of simplicity we do not discuss such constants in further detail.

Applying Theorem 1.1 to the case $f = F - G$ and $k = r = 1$, and using the triangle inequality we obtain the following result.

Corollary 1.2. *Let $n > 1$ be an integer and $1 \leqslant p, q \leqslant \infty$ be such that*

$$\frac{n}{q} \leqslant \frac{n-1+p}{p}. \tag{1.1}$$

If F and G are functions with domain the integers, then there is a positive number C depending only on n, p and q such that

$$\|\Delta F - \Delta G\|_q \leqslant C \, \|F - G\|_p^{1-\beta} \left(\|\Delta^n F\|_1 + \|\Delta^n G\|_1\right)^{\beta},$$

where

$$\beta = \frac{1 - 1/q + 1/p}{n - 1 + 1/p}. \tag{1.2}$$

The importance of Corollary 1.2 stems from the fact that if F and G are distribution functions of integer supported probability distributions, then some well known probability metrics can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathrm{K}}(F,G) &= \|F-G\|_\infty && \textit{(Kolmogorov metric),} \\ d_{\mathrm{W}}(F,G) &= \|F-G\|_1 && \textit{(Wasserstein metric),} \\ d_{\mathrm{loc}}(F,G) &= \|\Delta F-\Delta G\|_\infty && \textit{(local metric),} \\ d_{\mathrm{TV}}(F,G) &= \tfrac{1}{2}\|\Delta F-\Delta G\|_1 && \textit{(total variation metric).} \end{aligned}$$

Note that d_{loc} obtains its name from the fact that it is intimately connected to local limit theorems; see Section 4.

Corollary 1.2 implies, for example, that

$$d_{\mathrm{loc}}(F,G) \leqslant C\, d_{\mathrm{K}}(F,G)^{1/2}\big(\|\Delta^3 F\|_1 + \|\Delta^3 G\|_1\big)^{1/2}. \tag{1.3}$$

In this article we think of F as being a distribution of interest (e.g. the number of triangles in a random graph model) and of G as a well-known distribution which we are using to approximate F (e.g. a discretized normal or a translated Poisson distribution). Thus, if a bound on $d_{\mathrm{K}}(F,G)$ is known, then in order to bound $d_{\mathrm{loc}}(F,G)$, it is enough to obtain good bounds on $\|\Delta^3 F\|_1$ and $\|\Delta^3 G\|_1$. Whereas it will be easy to bound $\|\Delta^3 G\|_1$, since G is assumed to be an explicit distribution, estimating $\|\Delta^3 F\|_1$ is more involved. Therefore, (1.3) is only of use if we have techniques to bound $\|\Delta^3 F\|_1$ in non-trivial situations.

The purpose of this paper is two-fold. Firstly, in Section 2 we explore inequalities of the form (1.3); this is more or less a straightforward consequence of Corollary 1.2. Secondly, in Section 3 we develop tools to bound $\|\Delta^3 F\|_1$ and the analogous quantities appearing on the right hand side of generalizations of (1.3). In Section 4, we illustrate our approach in a few applications, in particular we obtain new local limit theorems with rates for the independence number of a geometric random graph, for the number of isolated vertices and triangles in Erdős-Rényi random graphs and the magnetization in the Curie-Weiss model. We also obtain other new limit theorems and rates for some of these applications.

2 MAIN RESULT

The next result is our main theorem, and is a slight generalisation of Corollary 1.2. The main purpose of the generalisation is to handle certain averaged local limit theorems where the corresponding pointwise results may not hold.

Let us introduce a last bit of notation before stating the main result. Let F be a distribution function with support on $\mathbb{Z}$. If m is a positive integer, define

$$\bar{F}^m(j) = \frac{F(j) + \cdots + F(j-m+1)}{m};$$

this is the distribution function of the convolution of F with the uniform distribution on $\{0, \ldots, m-1\}$; note that $\bar{F}^1 = F$.

Theorem 2.1. *If $l \geqslant 1$ and $m \geqslant 1$ are integers, then there is a constant $C > 0$ such that, for all distribution functions F and G of integer supported probability distributions,*

$$d_1(\bar{F}^m, \bar{G}^m) \leqslant C\, d_2(F,G)^{1-\beta} \left(\|\Delta^{l+1}\bar{F}^m\|_1 + \|\Delta^{l+1}\bar{G}^m\|_1\right)^{\beta}$$

for the following combinations of d_1, d_2 and β:

	d_1	d_2	β
(i)	d_{loc}	d_{TV}	$1/l$
(ii)	d_{loc}	d_{K}	$1/l$
(iii)	d_{loc}	d_{W}	$2/(l+1)$
(iv)	d_{TV}	d_{W}	$1/(l+1)$
(v)	d_{K}	d_{W}	$1/(l+1)$

(2.1)

Proof. To prove (ii)–(iv), apply Corollary 1.2 to the functions $\bar{F}^m$ and $\bar{G}^m$, $n = l+1$, and with the following values of p and q:

$$(ii)\ \ q = \infty, p = \infty, \qquad (iii)\ \ q = \infty, p = 1, \qquad (iv)\ \ q = 1, p = 1;$$

then use $d_2(\bar{F}^m, \bar{G}^m) \leqslant d_2(F,G)$. For (i) and (iv) use (ii) and (v), respectively, and then use the fact that $d_{\text{K}} \leqslant d_{\text{TV}}$. □

Let us make a couple of remarks at this point. First, we mainly use Theorem 2.1 with $m = 1$, where its meaning is most transparent. For $m > 1$, the following easy lemma should clarify our use of Theorem 2.1 below.

Lemma 2.2. *If X and Y are integer valued random variables with respective distribution functions F and G, then*

$$\sup_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \left| \mathbb{P}\left[\, X \in (k, k+m] \,\right] - \mathbb{P}\left[\, Y \in (k, k+m] \,\right] \right| = m\, d_{\text{loc}}(\bar{F}^m, \bar{G}^m).$$

Second, Theorem 2.1 is really a special case of Theorem 1.1 with $k = r = 1$, but it is clear that similar statements hold by applying Theorem 1.1 to other values of k and r. We choose the value $r = 1$ because we are able to bound $\|\Delta^n F\|_1$. Using the obvious inequality $\|\Delta^n F\|_\infty \leqslant \|\Delta^{n+1} F\|_1$, we could also usefully apply Theorem 1.1 with $r = \infty$, but this change has no effect on the value of β for a given k, q and p. The term $\|\Delta^2 F\|_\infty$ also appears in the local limit theorem results of McDonald (1979) and Davis and McDonald (1995). However, the crucial advantage of $\|\Delta^n F\|_1$ over $\|\Delta^n F\|_\infty$ is that the former is—as we will show—amenable to bounds via probabilistic techniques, whereas the latter seems difficult to handle directly.

3 ESTIMATING THE MEASURE OF SMOOTHNESS

In this section, we develop techniques to bound $\|\Delta^n \bar{F}^m\|_1$. To lighten the notation somewhat, write

$$D_{n,m}(F) := m \, \|\Delta^{n+1} \bar{F}^m\|_1,$$

and D_n for $D_{n,1}$. Furthermore, define recursively the difference operators

$$\Delta^n_m F(j) = \Delta^{n-1}_m F(j+m) - \Delta^{n-1}_m F(j),$$

where $\Delta^0_m F(j) = F(j)$.

The key to bounding $D_{n,m}(F)$ is the following representation.

Lemma 3.1. *Let n and m be non-negative integers. Let W be a random variable with integer support. Then*

$$D_{n,m}(\mathscr{L}(W)) = \sup_{\|g\|_\infty \leqslant 1} \mathbb{E} \Delta^n_m g(W).$$

Proof. We only show the case $n = 1$; the general case is similar. Denote $p_i = \mathbb{P}[W = i]$ for $i \in \mathbb{Z}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\Delta_m g(W) &= \sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} p_i \big(g(i+m) - g(i)\big) \\
&= \sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} (p_{i-m} - p_i) g(i) \\
&= m \sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} \left(\frac{p_{i-m} + \cdots + p_{i-1}}{m} - \frac{p_{i-m+1} + \cdots + p_i}{m} \right) g(i) \\
&= m \sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} \big(\Delta \bar{F}^m(i-2) - \Delta \bar{F}^m(i-1) \big) g(i) \\
&= -m \sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} \Delta^2 \bar{F}^m(i-2) \, g(i).
\end{aligned}$$

We see that for all g such that $\|g\|_\infty \leqslant 1$, $\mathbb{E}\Delta_m g(W) \leqslant m\,\|\Delta^2\bar{F}^m\|_1$, and choosing $g(i) = -\operatorname{sgn}\Delta^2\bar{F}^m(i-2)$ implies the claim. $\square$

The following sequence of lemmas provide tools for bounding $D_{n,m}(F)$. The proofs are mostly straightforward. We assume that all random variables are integer valued.

Lemma 3.2. *Let n and m be positive integers. Let W be a random variable. Then*

$$D_{n,m}(\mathscr{L}(W)) \leqslant mD_{n,1}(\mathscr{L}(W)).$$

Proof. Using a telescoping sum argument, this is immediate from the definition. $\square$

Lemma 3.3. *Let n and m be positive integers. Let W be a random variable, and let $\mathcal{F}$ be a σ-algebra. Then,*

$$D_{n,m}(\mathscr{L}(W)) \leqslant \mathbb{E}D_{n,m}(\mathscr{L}(W|\mathcal{F})).$$

Proof. If f is a bounded function, then

$$|\mathbb{E}\Delta_m^n f(W)| \leqslant \mathbb{E}|\mathbb{E}[\Delta_m^n f(W)|\mathcal{F})]| \leqslant \|f\|_\infty \mathbb{E}D_{n,m}(\mathscr{L}(W|\mathcal{F})). \qquad \square$$

Lemma 3.4. *If X_1 and X_2 are independent random variables, then, for all $n_1, n_2, m \geqslant 1$,*

$$D_{n_1+n_2,m}(\mathscr{L}(X_1+X_2)) \leqslant D_{n_1,m}(\mathscr{L}(X_1))D_{n_2,m}(\mathscr{L}(X_2)). \tag{3.1}$$

If $X_1, \dots, X_N$ is a sequence of independent random variables and $n \leqslant N$,

$$D_{n,m}(\mathscr{L}(X_1+\cdots+X_N)) \leqslant \prod_{i=1}^{n} D_{1,m}(\mathscr{L}(X_i)). \tag{3.2}$$

Proof. Let f be a bounded function. Define $g(x) := \mathbb{E}\Delta_m^{n_2} f(x+X_2)$ and note that, because of independence,

$$\mathbb{E}\Delta_m^{n_1+n_2} f(X_1+X_2) = \mathbb{E}\Delta_m^{n_1} g(X_1).$$

Hence

$$D_{n_1+n_2,m}(\mathscr{L}(X_1+X_2)) \leqslant D_{n_1,m}(X_1)\|g\|_\infty \leqslant D_{n_1,m}(X_1)D_{n_2,m}(X_2)\|f\|_\infty$$

which proves (3.1); (3.2) follows by induction and Lemma 3.3. $\square$

Lemma 3.5 (Mattner and Roos (2007), Corollary 1.6)**.** *Let* $X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_N$ *be a sequence of integer-valued random variables and* $S_N = \sum_{i=1}^N X_i$*. Then*

$$D_{1,1}(\mathscr{L}(S_N)) \leqslant 2\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}\left(\frac{1}{4} + \sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(1 - \tfrac{1}{2}D_{1,1}(\mathscr{L}(X_i))\right)\right)^{-1/2}.$$

The following two theorems are our main contributions in this section.

Theorem 3.6. *Let* (X, X') *be an exchangeable pair and let* $W := W(X)$ *and* $W' := W(X')$ *take values on the integers. Define*

$$Q_m(x) = \mathbb{P}[W' = W + m | X = x]$$

and $q_m = \mathbb{E}Q_m(X) = \mathbb{P}[W' = W + m]$*. Then, for every positive integer* m*,*

$$D_{1,m}(\mathscr{L}(W)) \leqslant \frac{\sqrt{\operatorname{Var} Q_m(X)} + \sqrt{\operatorname{Var} Q_{-m}(X)}}{q_m}.$$

Proof. To prove the first assertion, we must bound $|\mathbb{E}\Delta_m g(W)|$ for all g with norm no greater than one. To this end, exchangeability implies that for all bounded functions g

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= q_m^{-1}\mathbb{E}\big\{\mathrm{I}[W' = W + m]g(W') - \mathrm{I}[W' = W - m]g(W)\big\} \\ &= q_m^{-1}\mathbb{E}\big\{Q_m(X)g(W+m) - Q_{-m}(X)g(W)\big\}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} &|\mathbb{E}\Delta_m g(W)| \\ &\quad = \big|\mathbb{E}\big\{(1 - q_m^{-1}Q_m(X)g(W+k) - (1 - q_m^{-1}Q_{-m}(X)g(W)\big\}\big| \\ &\quad \leqslant \frac{\sqrt{\mathbb{E}\big\{g(W+m)^2\big\}\operatorname{Var} Q_m(X)} + \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\big\{g(W)^2\big\}\operatorname{Var} Q_{-m}(X)}}{q_m}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

where in the inequality we use first the triangle inequality and then Cauchy-Schwarz. Taking the supremum over g with $\|g\|_\infty \leqslant 1$ in (3.4) proves the theorem. □

Theorem 3.7. *Let* (X, X', X'') *be three consecutive steps of a reversible Markov chain in equilibrium. Let* W *and* W' *be as in Theorem 3.6 and, in addition,* $W'' := W(X'')$*. Define*

$$Q_{m_1,m_2}(x) = \mathbb{P}[W' = W + m_1, W'' = W' + m_2 | X = x].$$

Then, for every positive integer m,

$$D_{2,m}(\mathscr{L}(W)) \leqslant \frac{1}{q_m^2}\Big(2\operatorname{Var} Q_m(X) + \mathbb{E}\big|Q_{m,m}(X) - Q_m(X)^2\big| \\ + 2\operatorname{Var} Q_{-m}(X) + \mathbb{E}\big|Q_{-m,-m}(X) - Q_{-m}(X)^2\big|\Big).$$

Proof. Similar to the proof of Theorem 3.6, we want to bound $\mathbb{E}\Delta_m^2 g(W)$ for all g with norm no greater than one. We begin with the trivial equality

$$\mathbb{E}\big\{\mathrm{I}[W' = W + m, W'' = W' + m]g(W + m)\big\} \tag{3.5}$$
$$= \mathbb{E}\big\{\mathrm{I}[W' = W + m, W'' = W' + m]g(W')\big\}. \tag{3.6}$$

Conditioning on X in (3.5) and on X' in (3.6), the Markov property and reversibility imply

$$\mathbb{E}\big\{Q_{m,m}(X)g(W + m)\big\} = \mathbb{E}\big\{Q_m(X)Q_{-m}(X)g(W)\big\},$$

and similarly

$$\mathbb{E}\big\{Q_{-m,-m}(X)g(W)\big\} = \mathbb{E}\big\{Q_m(X)Q_{-m}(X)(W + m)\big\}.$$

Using these two equalities coupled with (3.3) it is not hard to see that for bounded g

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\Delta^2 g(W) \\
&\quad = \mathbb{E}\Big\{g(W+2)\Big(\big(1 - q_m^{-1}Q_m(X)\big)^2 + q_m^{-2}\big(Q_{m,m}(X) - Q_m(X)^2\big)\Big)\Big\} \\
&\qquad - 2\mathbb{E}\Big\{g(W+1)\big(1 - q_m^{-1}Q_m(X)\big)\big(1 - q_m^{-1}Q_{-m}(X)\big)\Big\} \\
&\qquad + \mathbb{E}\Big\{g(W)\Big(\big(1 - q_m^{-1}Q_{-m}(X)\big)^2 + q_m^{-2}\big(Q_{-m,-m}(X) - Q_{-m}(X)^2\big)\Big)\Big\}.
\end{aligned}$$

The theorem now follows by taking the supremum over g with norm no greater than one and applying the triangle inequality and Cauchy-Schwarz. □

4 APPLICATIONS

Because we are going to work in the total variation and local limit metrics, we need to use a discrete analog of the normal distribution. For the sake of concreteness, we use the *translated Poisson* distribution. We say that the random variable Z has the translated Poisson distribution, denoted $Z \sim \mathrm{TP}(\mu, \sigma^2)$, if $Z - \lfloor \mu - \sigma^2 \rfloor \sim \mathrm{Po}(\sigma^2 + \gamma)$, where $\gamma = \mu - \sigma^2 - \lfloor \mu - \sigma^2 \rfloor$.

Note that $\mathbb{E}Z = \mu$ and $\sigma^2 \leqslant \operatorname{Var} Z \leqslant \sigma^2 + 1$. The following lemma essentially states that we can use the translated Poisson distribution as a discrete substitute for the normal distribution and also provides bounds on the appropriate smoothing term.

Lemma 4.1. *If* $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ *and* $\sigma^2 > 0$, *then as* $\sigma \to \infty$,

$$D_{k,m}\big(\mathrm{TP}(\mu,\sigma^2)\big) = \mathrm{O}(\sigma^{-k}), \tag{4.1}$$

$$d_{\mathrm{K}}\big(\mathrm{TP}(\mu,\sigma^2), \mathrm{N}(\mu,\sigma^2)\big) = \mathrm{O}(\sigma^{-1}), \tag{4.2}$$

$$d_{\mathrm{W}}\big(\mathrm{TP}(\mu,\sigma^2), \mathrm{N}(\mu,\sigma^2)\big) = \mathrm{O}(1), \tag{4.3}$$

and

$$\sup_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}\left|\mathrm{TP}(\mu,\sigma)\{k\} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}}\exp\left(-\frac{(k-\mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right)\right| = \mathrm{O}\big(\sigma^{-2}\big). \tag{4.4}$$

Proof. Since $\mathrm{Po}(\sigma^2+\gamma)$ can be represented as the convolution of $\lfloor\sigma^2\rfloor$ Poisson distributions with means at least 1, (4.1) follows from Lemmas 3.2, 3.4 and 3.5. Using the same decomposition, the remaining properties follow from the classical theory of sums of independent random variables; we refer to Petrov (1975). □

Before moving on to our applications, we make a few remarks about Lemma 4.1 and its use in what follows. First note that the rates obtained in Lemma 4.1 hold in general for sums $X_1 + \cdots + X_n$ of independent identically distributed random variables with integer support and $D_1(X_1) < 2$. Also, in order to appreciate the Wasserstein bound in Lemma 4.1, the reader should keep in mind that for random variables X and Y and any positive constant c, we have

$$d_{\mathrm{W}}\big(\mathscr{L}(cX), \mathscr{L}(cY)\big) = c\, d_{\mathrm{W}}\big(\mathscr{L}(X), \mathscr{L}(Y)\big).$$

Finally, equation (4.4) is just the local limit theorem for the translated Poisson distribution. Such a statement is only informative if the right hand side of (4.4) is $\mathrm{o}(\sigma^{-1})$, because the left hand side is trivially $\mathrm{O}(\sigma^{-1})$. In this section we will prove bounds for $d_{\mathrm{loc}}\big(\mathscr{L}(W), \mathrm{TP}(\mu,\sigma^2)\big)$, which are better than $\mathrm{O}(\sigma^{-1})$ and therefore, by means of (4.4), will lead to a local limit theorem for W along with a rate of convergence.

4.1 Embedded sum of independent random variables

As the first application of our general theory, we consider the case where W has an embedded sum of independent random variables. This setting has been the most prominent way to prove local limit theorems by probabilistic arguments; see, for example, Davis and McDonald (1995), Röllin (2005), Barbour (2009), Behrisch, Coja-Oghlan, and Kang (2010) and Penrose and Peres (2011). In this case, our theory can be used to obtain rates for the accuracy of the approximation if rates of convergence for W to its limit are known.

Let W is an integer-valued random variable with variance σ^2 and let $\mathcal{F}$ be some σ-algebra. Assume that W allows for a decomposition of the form

$$W = Y + \sum_{i=1}^{N} Z_i, \tag{4.5}$$

where N is $\mathcal{F}$-measurable, and where, conditional on $\mathcal{F}$, we have that $Y, Z_1, \dots, Z_N$ are all independent of each other. Note that in what follows, the distribution of Y is not relevant.

Theorem 4.2. *Let $W = W(\sigma)$ be a family of integer-valued random variable with $\operatorname{Var} W = \sigma^2$ satisfying (4.5). Assume there are constants u and β, independent of σ^2, such that, conditional on $\mathcal{F}$,*

$$0 < u \leqslant 1 - \tfrac{1}{2} D_1(Z_i) \tag{4.6}$$

for all $1 \leqslant i \leqslant N$, and such that

$$\mathbb{P}[N < \beta\sigma^2] = \mathrm{O}(\sigma^{-k}) \tag{4.7}$$

as $\sigma \to \infty$ for some $k \geqslant 2$. With $\tilde{W} = (W - \mathbb{E}W)/\sigma$, then as $\sigma \to \infty$,

$$d_{\mathrm{loc}}\bigl(\mathscr{L}(W), \mathrm{TP}(\mathbb{E}W, \sigma^2)\bigr) = \mathrm{O}\left(\frac{d_{\mathrm{K}}\bigl(\mathscr{L}(\tilde{W}), \Phi\bigr)^{1-1/k}}{\sigma}\right),$$

and

$$d_{\mathrm{loc}}\bigl(\mathscr{L}(W), \mathrm{TP}(\mathbb{E}W, \sigma^2)\bigr) = \mathrm{O}\left(\frac{d_{\mathrm{W}}\bigl(\mathscr{L}(\tilde{W}), \Phi\bigr)^{1-2/(k+1)}}{\sigma}\right).$$

Retaining the previous hypotheses, if (4.7) holds now for some $k \geqslant 1$, then

$$d_{\mathrm{TV}}\bigl(\mathscr{L}(W), \mathrm{TP}(\mathbb{E}W, \sigma^2)\bigr) = \mathrm{O}\Bigl(d_{\mathrm{W}}\bigl(\mathscr{L}(\tilde{W}), \Phi\bigr)^{k/(k+1)}\Bigr),$$

as $\sigma \to \infty$.

Proof. First, consider the setup conditional on $\mathcal{F}$. Divide the sum $Z_1 + \cdots + Z_N$ into k successive blocks, each of size $\lfloor N/k \rfloor$, plus one last block with less than $\lfloor N/k \rfloor$ elements, which we will ignore in the following estimates. By Lemma 3.4 we have

$$D_k(W|\mathcal{F}) \leqslant \prod_{l=1}^{k} \eta_l,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_l &= D_1\bigl(Z_{(l-1)\lfloor N/k \rfloor+1} + \cdots + Z_{l\lfloor N/k \rfloor}\bigr) \\ &\leqslant \frac{8}{\pi}\Biggl(\frac{1}{4} + \sum_{i=(l-1)\lfloor N/k \rfloor+1}^{l\lfloor N/k \rfloor} \bigl(1 - \tfrac{1}{2}D_1(Z_i)\bigr)\Biggr)^{-1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used Lemma 3.5. From (4.6), for $l = 1, \ldots, k$,

$$\eta_l \leqslant 2 \wedge \biggl(\frac{8}{\pi \lfloor N/k \rfloor u}\biggr).$$

Now, assume without loss of generality that $\sigma^2 > k/\beta$. Since we can always bound $D_k(W)$ by 2^k, we have

$$D_k(W|\mathcal{F}) \leqslant 2^k \mathrm{I}[N < \beta\sigma^2] + 2\mathrm{I}[N \geqslant \beta\sigma^2]\biggl(\frac{8k}{\pi u(\beta\sigma^2 - k)}\biggr)^{k/2}.$$

Hence, by Lemma 3.3,

$$D_k(W) \leqslant \mathbb{E}D_k(W|\mathcal{F}) \leqslant 2^k \mathbb{P}[N < \beta\sigma^2] + 2\biggl(\frac{8k}{\pi u(\beta\sigma^2 - k)}\biggr)^{k/2},$$

which is $\mathrm{O}(\sigma^{-k})$ as $\sigma \to \infty$. After noting that since W is integer valued, the scaling $\sigma^{-1} = \mathrm{O}\bigl(d_{\mathrm{W}}\bigl(\mathscr{L}(\tilde{W}), \Phi\bigr) \wedge d_{\mathrm{K}}\bigl(\mathscr{L}(\tilde{W}), \Phi\bigr)\bigr)$, the claims now follows easily from *(ii)*, *(iii)*, and *(iv)* of Theorem 2.1, and Lemma 4.1. $\square$

Note that, under the stated conditions, Theorem 4.2 implies the LLT for W if it satisfies the CLT, as the latter also implies convergence in the Kolmogorov metric. If a rate of convergence is available, Theorem 4.2 also yields a rate of convergence for the LLT.

Let us apply now Theorem 4.2 to the so-called *independence number* of a random graph. The independence number of a graph G is defined to be the maximal number of vertices that one can pick from the graph so that no two of these vertices are connected.

Consider the following random graph model, which is a simplified version of one discussed by Penrose and Yukich (2005). Consider an open set $U \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \geqslant 1$, of finite volume, which, without loss of generality, we assume to be 1. Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a homogeneous Poisson point process on U with intensity λ with respect to the Lebesgue measure. Define $G(\mathcal{X}, b)$ to be the graph on the vertex set $\mathcal{X}$ by connecting two vertices whenever they are at most distant r apart from each other. In the context of this random geometric graph, the independence number is the maximal number of closed balls of radius $r/2$ with centers chosen from $\mathcal{X}$, so that no two balls are intersecting.

Theorem 4.3 (Penrose and Yukich (2005))**.** *Let* $W_b = \beta\bigl(G(\mathcal{X}, b\lambda^{-1/d})\bigr)$. *Then, for* b *small enough, we have* $\operatorname{Var} W_b \asymp \lambda$ *and*

$$d_{\mathrm{K}}\biggl(\mathscr{L}\Bigl(\frac{W_b - \mathbb{E}W_b}{\sqrt{\operatorname{Var} W_b}}\Bigr), \mathrm{N}(0,1)\biggr) = \mathrm{O}\bigl(\log(\lambda)^{3d}\lambda^{-1/2}\bigr)$$

as $\lambda \to \infty$.

Note that the condition "for b small enough" is necessary to guarantee the asymptotic order of the variance of W_b; see Penrose and Yukich (2005) for more details. We can give a local limit result as follows.

Theorem 4.4. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 4.3, we have that for every* $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$d_{\mathrm{loc}}\bigl(\mathscr{L}(W_b), \mathrm{TP}(\mathbb{E}W_b, \operatorname{Var} W_b)\bigr) = \mathrm{O}\bigl(\lambda^{-1+\varepsilon}\bigr),$$

as $\lambda \to \infty$

Proof. Let $r = b\lambda^{-1/d}/2$. Denote by $B_r(x)$ the closed ball with radius r and center x; define $\partial B_r(x) = B_{2r}(x) \setminus B_r(x)$. Now, choose n non-intersecting balls in U, each of radius $3r$ and centers $x_1, \dots, x_n$; it is clear that it is possible to have $n \asymp \lambda$. For ball $B_{3r}(x_i)$, define the indicators

$$I_i = \mathrm{I}[\partial B_r(x_i) \cap \mathcal{X} \text{ is empty}], \qquad J_i = \mathrm{I}[B_r(x_i) \cap \mathcal{X} \text{ is not empty}].$$

Note that the I_i are independent and identically distributed and, hence, $N = \sum_{i=1}^n I_i \sim \mathrm{Bi}(n,p)$ with $p = \mathbb{E}I_i$ being bounded away from 1 and 0 as $\lambda \to \infty$. We let $\mathcal{F} = \sigma(I_1, \dots, I_n)$. Furthermore note that if $I_1 = 1$, then J_i is exactly the contribution of the ball $B_{2r}(x_i)$ to the independence number W_b, as within $B_r(x_i)$ all the vertices are connected and there is no connection to any other vertices outside $B_{2r}(x_i)$. Therefore we can find Y such that

$$W_n = Y + \sum_{j=1}^{N} J_{K_j},$$

where $K_1, \dots, K_N$ are the indices of those balls with $I_i = 1$. Given $\mathcal{F}$, note that $J_{K_1}, \dots, J_{K_N}$ are independent $\mathrm{Be}(q)$, with with $q = \mathbb{E}J_{K_j}$ being bounded away from 0 and 1, and they are also independent of Y. This implies condition (4.6) for $u = q \wedge (1-q)$ which is bounded away from 0 as $\lambda \to \infty$. Using usual exponential tail bounds for the binomial distribution, it is easy to see that, for every k, one can find β such that (4.7) holds. In combination with Theorem 4.3, Theorem 4.2 now yields the claim. ☐

4.2 Magnetization in the Curie-Weiss Model

Let $\beta > 0$, $h \in \mathbb{R}$ and for $\sigma \in \{-1,1\}^n$ define the Gibbs measure

$$\mathbb{P}(\sigma) = Z^{-1} \exp\biggl\{\frac{\beta}{n}\sum_{i<j}\sigma_i\sigma_j + h\sum_i \sigma_i\biggr\}, \tag{4.8}$$

where Z is the appropriate normalizing constant.

This probability model is referred to as the Curie-Weiss model and a quantity of interest is the magnetization $W = \sum_i \sigma_i$ of the system. See Talagrand (2011) for an introduction to the vast literature around these models. We have the following known results.

Theorem 4.5 (Ellis, Newman, and Rosen (1980, Theorem 2.2))**.** *Let σ have law given by (4.8) with $0 < \beta < 1$, and $h \in \mathbb{R}$. Also, let m_0 be the unique solution to*

$$m = \tanh(\beta m + h).$$

Then there is a constant C depending only on β and h such that, as $n \to \infty$,

$$d_{\mathrm{K}}\Bigl(\mathscr{L}\Bigl(\tfrac{W - nm_0}{n^{1/2}}\Bigr), \mathrm{N}\Bigl(0, \tfrac{1-m_0^2}{1-\beta+\beta m_0^2}\Bigr)\Bigr) \to 0.$$

Theorem 4.6 (Eichelsbacher and Löwe (2010, Theorems 3.3 and 3.7))**.** *Let σ have law given by (4.8) with $0 < \beta < 1$, and $h = 0$. Then there is a constant C depending only on β such that*

$$d_{\mathrm{K}}\bigl(\mathscr{L}(n^{-1/2}W), \mathrm{N}(0,(1-\beta)^{-1})\bigr) \leqslant Cn^{-1/2};$$

the same bound holds for the Wasserstein metric.

Let us now give a total variation metric and local limit version of these results.

Theorem 4.7. *Let W be as before and let $\delta = \delta(n) = (1-(-1)^n)/2$. For $0 < \beta < 1$ and $h = 0$, there is a constant C that only depends on β such that*

$$d_{\mathrm{loc}}\big(\mathscr{L}((W+\delta)/2), \mathrm{TP}\big(0, \tfrac{n}{4(1-\beta)}\big)\big) \leqslant Cn^{-3/4},$$
$$d_{\mathrm{TV}}\big(\mathscr{L}((W+\delta)/2), \mathrm{TP}\big(0, \tfrac{n}{4(1-\beta)}\big)\big) \leqslant Cn^{-1/3}.$$

If $0 < \beta < 1$, $h \in \mathbb{R}$, and m_0 is as in Theorem 4.5, then there is a constant C that only depends on β and h such that as $n \to \infty$,

$$d_{\mathrm{loc}}\Big(\mathscr{L}\left(\tfrac{W+\delta}{2}\right), \mathrm{TP}\big(\tfrac{m_0}{2}, \tfrac{n(1-m_0^2)}{4(1-\beta+\beta m_0^2)}\big)\Big) = \mathrm{o}\big(n^{-1/2}\big)$$

Proof. The proof follows easily from (*ii*), (*iii*) and (*iv*) of Theorem 2.1 with $m = 1$ and $l = 2$, Lemma 4.1, Theorems 4.6 and 4.5, and the bounds on the smoothing terms read from Lemma 4.8 below. □

Remark 4.1. In the critical case where $\beta = 1$, a bound is known on the Wasserstein distance between the magnetization (appropriately normalized) and its non-normal limiting distribution Eichelsbacher and Löwe (2010, Theorem 3.3). The smoothing bounds of Lemma 4.8 below apply to this case with $h = 0$ (see Remark 4.2) and could be used to prove new bounds on the total variation distance between the magnetization and a discrete version of this limiting distribution. However, we omit this result due to the inappropriate amount of space it would take for a precise formulation.

In order to apply our theory we use Theorem 3.7 to bound the necessary smoothing terms. For this purpose, let σ as in the theorem and σ' be a step from σ in the following reversible Markov chain: at each step of the chain a site from the n possible sites is chosen uniformly at random and then the spin at that site is resampled according to the Gibbs measure (4.8) conditional on the value of the spins at all other sites. Let $W = \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i$ and $W' = \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i'$ and note that (W, W') is an exchangeable pair. Finally, define

$$Q_m = \mathbb{P}[W' = W + m|\sigma],$$

$q_m = \mathbb{E}Q_m$, and

$$Q_{m_1,m_2} = \mathbb{P}[W' = W + m_1, W'' = W' + m_2|\sigma].$$

where W'' is obtained from W' in the same way that W' is obtained from W (i.e. (W, W', W'') are the magnetizations in three consecutive steps in the stationary Markov chain described above). We will show the following result.

Lemma 4.8. *Let* $0 < \beta < 1$, $h \in \mathbb{R}$ *and* $m = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sigma_i$, *and let* m_0 *be the unique solution to*

$$m = \tanh(\beta m + h). \tag{4.9}$$

Then, for $k = \pm 2$,

$$\left|Q_k - \frac{1-m_0^2}{4}\right| \leqslant C\biggl(|m-m_0| + \frac{1}{n}\biggr), \tag{4.10}$$

$$|Q_{k,k} - Q_k^2| = \mathrm{O}(n^{-1}), \tag{4.11}$$

and

$$\left|q_k - \frac{1-m_0^2}{4}\right| = \mathrm{O}(n^{-1/2}), \qquad \mathrm{Var}(Q_k) = \mathrm{O}(n^{-1}). \tag{4.12}$$

Proof. We only consider $k = 2$, the case $k = -2$ being similar. An easy calculation shows that,

$$\mathbb{P}(\sigma_i' = 1|(\sigma_j)_{j\neq i}) = \frac{\exp\bigl\{\frac{\beta}{n}\sum_{j\neq i}\sigma_j + h\bigr\}}{\exp\bigl\{\frac{\beta}{n}\sum_{j\neq i}\sigma_j + h\bigr\} + \exp\bigl\{-\frac{\beta}{n}\sum_{j\neq i}\sigma_j - h\bigr\}},$$

so that for $m_i := n^{-1}\sum_{j\neq i}\sigma_i$, we have

$$Q_2 = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{1-\sigma_i}{2}\frac{\tanh(\beta m_i + h) + 1}{2}.$$

Now, some simplification shows

$$\begin{aligned} Q_2 = {} & \frac{1}{4} - \frac{m}{4} + \frac{\tanh(\beta m + h)}{4}(1-m) \\ & + \frac{1}{4n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(1-\sigma_i)(\tanh(\beta m_i + h) - \tanh(\beta m + h)). \end{aligned}$$

Thus we find

$$\begin{aligned} \left|Q_2 - \frac{1-m_0^2}{4}\right| \leqslant {} & \frac{1}{4}\bigl|m - m_0\bigr| + \frac{1}{4}\bigl|\tanh(\beta m_0 + h) - \tanh(\beta m + h)\bigr| \\ & + \frac{1}{4}\bigl|m\tanh(\beta m + h) - m_0\tanh(\beta m_0 + h)\bigr| \\ & + \frac{1}{4n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(1-\sigma_i)|\tanh(\beta m_i + h) - \tanh(\beta m + h)|. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\tanh(x) \in (-1,1)$ is 1-Lipschitz and $-1 \leqslant m \leqslant 1$ the first part of the claim now easily follows.

For the second assertion, note that

$$Q_{2,2} = \frac{1}{16n^2} \sum_{i \neq j} (1-\sigma_i)(\tanh(\beta m_i + h) + 1) \\ \times (1-\sigma_j)(\tanh(\beta m_{i,j} + \beta n^{-1} + h) + 1),$$

where $m_{i,j} = \beta n^{-1} \sum_{k \neq i,j} \sigma_k$, and also that

$$Q_2^2 = \frac{1}{16n^2} \sum_{i,j} (1-\sigma_i)(\tanh(\beta m_i + h) + 1)(1-\sigma_j)(\tanh(\beta m_j + h) + 1).$$

We can now find

$$|Q_{2,2} - Q_2^2| \leqslant \frac{1}{8n^2} \sum_{i} (1-\sigma_i)(\tanh(\beta m_i + h) + 1)^2 \\ + \frac{1}{8n^2} \sum_{i \neq j} (1-\sigma_i)(1-\sigma_j) |\tanh(\beta m_i + h) + 1| \\ \times \bigl|\tanh(\beta m_{i,j} + \beta n^{-1} + h) - \tanh(\beta m_j + h)\bigr|.$$

Straightforward estimates now yield (4.11).

The remaining assertions (4.12) follow from (4.10) and $\mathbb{E}|m - m_0|^k = \mathrm{O}\bigl(n^{-k/2}\bigr)$ which is obtained from standard concentration results; see e.g. Chatterjee (2007, Proposition 1.3). $\square$

Remark 4.2. Lemma 4.8 easily extends to the case $\beta \geqslant 1$ if $h = 0$ as the solutions to (4.9) are symmetric around 0 and therefore m_0^2 is the same for any such solution.

4.3 Isolated vertices in the Erdős-Rényi random graph

In this and the next section we will derive LLTs for the number of isolated vertices and triangles in the Erdős-Rényi random graph, respectively. LLTs related to random graphs using probabilistic methods seem to be sparse. Behrisch et al. (2010) obtain LLTs for the size of the maximal component in hypergraphs using an embedding idea related to Section 4.1. Similar results on the maximal component such as Stepanov (1970) are more analytic in nature. Using combinatorial arguments, Bender, Canfield, and McKay (1997) obtain very detailed information about the number of isolated vertices for graphs with a given number of vertices and edges. To the best of our knowledge, the following results on the number of isolated vertices and number of triangles are new.

In order to estimate the smoothness in the random graph examples we will make use of Theorems 3.6 and 3.7 and then combine them with Theorem 2.1 to obtain the local limit results. Define $G = G(n, p)$ to be a random graph with n vertices where each edge appears with probability p, independent of all other edges. From this point, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 4.9 (Kordecki (1990); Barbour, Karoński, and Ruciński (1989))**.** *Let $W = W(n, p)$ be the number of isolated vertices of $G(n, p)$, and let $\tilde{W}$ be W normalized to have zero mean and unit variance. Then $\tilde{W}$ converges in distribution to the standard normal if and only if*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} n^2 p = \lim_{n\to\infty} (\log(n) - np) = \infty. \tag{4.13}$$

In that case, with $\sigma_n^2 = \operatorname{Var} W$,

$$d_{\mathrm{K}}(\mathscr{L}(\tilde{W}), \Phi) = \mathrm{O}(\sigma_n^{-1}).$$

The conditions of convergence was proved by Barbour et al. (1989), whereas the bounds for the Kolmogorov metric was obtained by Kordecki (1990).

We now summarize the results derived from the combination of Theorem 4.9 and Theorem 2.1. For two distribution functions F and G with integer support, let

$$d_{\mathrm{loc}}^m(F, G) = \|\Delta \bar{F}^m - \Delta \bar{G}^m\|_\infty.$$

Note that $d_{\mathrm{loc}} = d_{\mathrm{loc}}^1$ and recall also the inequality given by Lemma 2.2.

Theorem 4.10. *Let $W = W(n, p)$ be the number of isolated vertices in an Erdős-Rényi random graph $G(n, p)$ and $\tilde{W}$ be W normalized to have zero mean and unit variance. With $\mu_n = \mathbb{E}W$ and $\sigma_n^2 = \mathrm{Var}(W)$, we have the following.*

(i) If $\lim_{n\to\infty}(\log(n) - np) = \infty$, and either $\lim_{n\to\infty} np = \infty$ or $\lim_{n\to\infty} np = c > 0$, then $\sigma_n^2 \asymp ne^{-np}$ and

$$d_{\mathrm{loc}}\big(\mathscr{L}(W), \mathrm{TP}(\mu_n, \sigma_n^2)\big) = \mathrm{O}\big(\sigma_n^{-3/2}\big).$$

(ii) If $\lim_{n\to\infty} np = 0$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty} n^2 p = \infty$, then $\sigma_n^2 \asymp n^2 p$ and

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathrm{loc}}\big(\mathscr{L}(W), \mathrm{TP}(\mu_n, \sigma_n^2)\big) &= \mathrm{O}\big(\sigma_n^{-1}\big(np^{3/4}\big)^{-1}\big), \\ d_{\mathrm{loc}}^2\big(\mathscr{L}(W), \mathrm{TP}(\mu_n, \sigma_n^2)\big) &= \mathrm{O}\big(\sigma_n^{-3/2}\big). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. After noting

$$\sigma_n^2 = n(1-p)^{n-1}\big[1 + (np-1)(1-p)^{n-2}\big],$$

the result follows from *(ii)* of Theorem 2.1 with $l = 2$, using the known rates stated above in Theorem 4.9 coupled with Lemma 4.1, and bounds on the smoothing quantities provided by Lemma 4.11 below. $\square$

Remark 4.3. The bounds on the smoothing quantities presented below can be written in terms of n and p, so that the asymptotic results of the theorem can be written explicitly whenever the bounds on $d_{\mathrm{K}}(\tilde{W}, \Phi)$ are also explicit.

Remark 4.4. The second case of the theorem is interesting and deserves elaboration. In some regimes, our bounds do not imply a LLT in the natural lattice of span one (e.g. $p \asymp n^{-\alpha}$, where $\alpha > 4/3$), but we can obtain a useful rate in the d_{loc}^2 distance. This implies that the approximation is better by averaging the probability mass function of W over two neighbouring integers and then comparing this value to its analog for the normal density. One explanation for this phenomenon is that in such a regime, the graph $G(n,p)$ will be extremely sparse so that parity of W will be dominated by the number of isolated edges. In other words, up to a coin toss with small success probability, $n - W$ will be approximately equal to twice the number of isolated edges, in which case we would not expect the normal density to be a good approximation for each point on the integer lattice.

Lemma 4.11. *Let $W = W(n,p)$ be the number of isolated vertices in an Erdős-Rényi graph $G(n,p)$.*

(i) *If $\lim_{n\to\infty}(\log(n) - np) = \infty$, and either $\lim_{n\to\infty} np = \infty$ or $\lim_{n\to\infty} np = c > 0$, then*

$$D_1(W) = \mathrm{O}\big(\sigma_n^{-1}\big), \qquad D_2(W) = \mathrm{O}\big(\sigma_n^{-2}\big).$$

(ii) *If $\lim_{n\to\infty} np = 0$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty} n^2 p = \infty$, then*

$$D_1(W) = \mathrm{O}\Big(\big(\sqrt{np}\,\sigma_n\big)^{-1}\Big), \qquad D_2(W) = \mathrm{O}\Big((np)^{-1}\sigma_n^{-2}\Big),$$
$$D_{1,2}(W) = \mathrm{O}\big(\sigma_n^{-1}\big), \qquad D_{2,2}(W) = \mathrm{O}\big(\sigma_n^{-2}\big).$$

Proof. We will apply Theorems 3.6 and 3.7 by constructing a Markov chain on graphs with n vertices which is reversible with respect to the law of $G(n,p)$. From a given graph G, define a step in the chain to G' by choosing two vertices of G uniformly at random and independently resampling the "edge" between them. It is clear that this Markov chain is reversible with respect to the distribution of $G(n, p)$.

Now, let $W = W(n, p)$ be the number of isolated vertices of the Erdős-Rényi graph $G = G(n, p)$ and and W' be the number of isolated vertices of G', a step in the chain described above. In order to compute the terms needed to apply Theorems 3.6 and 3.7, we need some auxiliary random variables. Let W_k be the number of vertices of degree k in G (so that $W_0 \equiv W$), and E_2 be the number of connected pairs of vertices each having degree one (that is, E_2 is the number of isolated edges). In the notation of Theorems 3.6 and 3.7, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_1(G) &= \frac{(W_1 - 2E_2)}{\binom{n}{2}}(1-p), & Q_{-1}(G) &= \frac{W(n-W)}{\binom{n}{2}}p,\\
Q_{1,1}(G) &= \frac{2\binom{W_1-2E2}{2}}{\binom{n}{2}^2}(1-p)^2, & Q_{-1,-1}(G) &= \frac{4\binom{W}{2}\binom{n-W+1}{2}}{\binom{n}{2}^2}p^2,\\
Q_2(G) &= \frac{E_2}{\binom{n}{2}}(1-p), & Q_{-2}(G) &= \frac{\binom{W}{2}}{\binom{n}{2}}p,\\
Q_{2,2}(G) &= \frac{2\binom{E_2}{2}}{\binom{n}{2}^2}(1-p)^2, & Q_{-2,-2}(G) &= \frac{\binom{W}{2}\binom{W-2}{2}}{\binom{n}{2}^2}p^2.
\end{aligned}$$

These equalities are obtained through straightforward considerations. For example, in order for one step in the chain to increase the number of isolated vertices by one, an edge of G must be chosen that has exactly one end vertex of degree one, and then must be removed upon resampling. For one step in the chain to decrease the number of isolated vertices by one, an isolated vertex must be connected to a vertex with positive degree.

From this point, the lemma will follow after computing the pertinent moment information needed to apply Theorems 3.6 and 3.7. By considering appropriate indicator functions, it is an elementary combinatorial exercise to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}W_1 = 2\binom{n}{2}p(1-p)^{n-2}, \qquad \mathbb{E}E_2 = \binom{n}{2}p(1-p)^{2n-4},\\
&\mathbb{E}W_1^2 = 2\binom{n}{2}p(1-p)^{n-2} + 2p\binom{n}{2}\left[(1-p)^{2n-4} + p(n-2)^2(1-p)^{2n-5}\right],\\
&\mathbb{E}E_2^2 = \binom{n}{2}p(1-p)^{2n-4} + 6\binom{n}{4}p^2(1-p)^{4n-12},
\end{aligned}$$

$$\mathbb{E}W_1E_2 = \binom{n}{2} p(1-p)^{2n-4}\big[(n-2)(n-3)p(1-p)^{n-4} + 2\big],$$

which will yield the results for negative jumps, and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}W = n(1-p)^{n-1}, \qquad \mathbb{E}W^2 = n(1-p)^{n-1} + 2\binom{n}{2}(1-p)^{2n-3},\\
&\mathbb{E}W^3 = n(1-p)^{n-1} + 6\binom{n}{2}(1-p)^{2n-3} + 6\binom{n}{3}(1-p)^{3n-6},\\
&\mathbb{E}W^4 = n(1-p)^{n-1} + 14\binom{n}{2}(1-p)^{2n-3}\\
&\qquad\qquad + 36\binom{n}{3}(1-p)^{3n-6} + 24\binom{n}{4}(1-p)^{4n-10},
\end{aligned}$$

which will yield the results for the positive jumps. Theorems 3.6 and 3.7 now give the desired rates. As an example of these calculations, note that for $q_1 = \mathbb{E}Q_1(G)$, we have

$$\frac{\operatorname{Var} Q_1(G)}{q_1^2} = \frac{\mathbb{E}W_1^2 - 4\mathbb{E}W_1E_2 + 4\mathbb{E}E_2^2 - (\mathbb{E}W_1 - 2\mathbb{E}E_2)^2}{(\mathbb{E}W_1 - 2\mathbb{E}E_2)^2}, \tag{4.14}$$

which after the dust settles is $\mathrm{O}\big(n^{-1}e^{np}\big)$ in case (i) of the theorem. Similarly, since $q_1 = \mathbb{E}Q_{-1}$, we have

$$\frac{\operatorname{Var} Q_{-1}(G)}{q_1^2} = \frac{\mathbb{E}W^4 - 2n\mathbb{E}W^3 + n^2\mathbb{E}W^2 - (n\mathbb{E}W - \mathbb{E}W^2)^2}{(n\mathbb{E}W - \mathbb{E}W^2)^2}, \tag{4.15}$$

which is again $\mathrm{O}\big(n^{-1}e^{np}\big)$ in case (i). Theorem 3.6 implies that $D_1(W)$ is bounded above by the sum of the square roots of the terms in (4.14) and (4.15) so that in case (i),

$$D_1(W) = \mathrm{O}\Big(n^{-1/2}e^{\frac{np}{2}}\Big) = \mathrm{O}\big(\sigma_n^{-1}\big).$$

For the second part of (i), note that

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}|Q_{1,1} - Q_1^2|}{q_1^2} \leqslant \frac{\mathbb{E}W_1 + 2\mathbb{E}E_2}{(\mathbb{E}W_1 - 2\mathbb{E}E_2)^2},$$

which is $\mathrm{O}\big(n^{-2}p^{-1}e^{np}\big)$ in case (i) and

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}|Q_{-1,-1} - Q_{-1}^2|}{q_1^2} = \frac{\mathbb{E}\big(W(n-W)|n-2W+1|\big)}{(n\mathbb{E}W - \mathbb{E}W^2)^2} \leqslant \frac{n+1}{n\mathbb{E}W - \mathbb{E}W^2},$$

which is $\mathrm{O}\big(n^{-1}e^{np}\big)$ in case (i), so that we have

$$D_2(W) = \mathrm{O}\big(n^{-1}e^{np}\big) = \mathrm{O}\big(\sigma_n^{-2}\big).$$

This proves (i); the remaining bounds are similar and hence omitted. $\square$

4.4 Triangles in the Erdős-Rényi random graph

In this section we use Theorems 2.1, 3.6, and 3.7 to first obtain a new rate of convergence in the total variation distance between the normal distribution and the number of triangles in an Erdős-Rényi random graph. We then use this new rate to obtain a local limit theorem for this example. As in Subsection 4.3, define $G = G(n, p)$ to be a random graph with n vertices where each edge appears with probability p, independent of all other edges. From this point, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 4.12 (Ruciński (1988), Barbour et al. (1989))**.** *Let $W = W(n, p)$ be the number of triangles of $G(n, p)$, and let $\tilde{W}$ be W normalized to have zero mean and unit variance. Then $\tilde{W}$ converges to the standard normal if and only if*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} np = \lim_{n\to\infty} n^2(1-p) = \infty.$$

In that case, with $\sigma_n^2 = \operatorname{Var} W$,

$$d_{\mathrm{W}}(\mathscr{L}(\tilde{W}), \Phi) = \mathrm{O}(\sigma_n^{-1}).$$

We now summarize the results derived from the bound of Theorem 4.12 coupled with our theory above.

Theorem 4.13. *Let $W = W(n, p)$ be the number of triangles in an Erdős-Rényi random graph $G(n, p)$. If $n^\alpha p \to c > 0$ with $1/2 \leqslant \alpha < 1$ then, with $\mu_n = \mathbb{E}W$ and $\sigma_n^2 := \operatorname{Var}(W)$, we have $\sigma_n^2 \asymp n^3 p^3$ and*

$$d_{\mathrm{TV}}\big(\mathscr{L}(W), \mathrm{TP}(\mu_n, \sigma_n^2)\big) = \mathrm{O}\big(n^{-(1-\alpha)}\big),$$

and

$$d_{\mathrm{loc}}\big(\mathscr{L}(W), \mathrm{TP}(\mu_n, \sigma_n^2)\big) = \mathrm{O}\big(\sigma_n^{-1} n^{-(1-\alpha)/2}\big).$$

Proof. After noting that

$$\sigma_n^2 = \binom{n}{3}\left(p^3(1-p^3) + 3(n-3)p^5(1-p)\right),$$

the result follows from (*iv*) and then (*i*) (or (*iii*)) of Theorem 2.1 with $l = 2$ and $m = 1$ using the known rates stated above in Theorem 4.12 coupled with Lemma 4.1, and bounds on the smoothing quantities provided by Lemma 4.14 below. $\square$

Remark 4.5. It is worthwhile noting that we obtain the LLT only for those values of α for which we have $\mathbb{E}W \asymp \operatorname{Var} W$. In contrast, if $0 < \alpha < 1/2$, we have that $\mathbb{E}W \asymp n^{3-3\alpha}$, whereas $\operatorname{Var} W \asymp n^{4-5\alpha} \gg \mathbb{E}W$. It is not clear if a standard LLT will hold in this regime as the probability mass is scattered over an interval that is relatively large compared to the expected number of triangles due to the strong dependence. The point probabilities may therefore behave in a much less controlled way; c.f. Remark 4.4 following Theorem 4.10.

Lemma 4.14. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 4.13,*

$$D_1(W) = \mathrm{O}\bigl(\sigma_n^{-1}\bigr), \qquad D_2(W) = \mathrm{O}\bigl(\sigma_n^{-2}\bigr). \tag{4.16}$$

In order to prove Lemma 4.14, we will apply Theorems 3.6 and 3.7 by constructing a Markov chain on graphs with n vertices which is reversible with respect to the law of $G(n,p)$. From a given graph G, define a step in the chain to G' by choosing two vertices of G uniformly at random and independently resampling the "edge" between them. It is clear that this Markov chain is reversible with respect to the distribution of $G(n,p)$. We are now in a position to compute the terms needed to apply Theorems 3.6 and 3.7.

Lemma 4.15. *Let (W, W') be the number of triangles in the exchangeable pair of Erdős-Rényi graphs (G, G') as defined above. If $Q_1(G) = \mathbb{P}[W' = W + 1|G]$, then*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\operatorname{Var} Q_1(G) \\
&\quad\leqslant \frac{(n-2)}{\binom{n}{2}} p^4(1-p)(1-p^2)^{n-3}\bigl(1-p^2(1-p)(1-p^2)^{n-3}\bigr) && (4.17)\\
&\quad+ \frac{4\binom{n-2}{2}}{\binom{n}{2}} p^5(1-p)^2\bigl((1-2p^2+p^3)^{n-4} - p(1-p^2)^{2n-6}\bigr) && (4.18)\\
&\quad+ \frac{4\binom{n-2}{2}}{\binom{n}{2}} p^5(1-p)^2(1-p^2)^{2n-8}\bigl(1-p-p(1-p^2)^2\bigr) && (4.19)\\
&\quad+ \frac{12\binom{n-2}{3}}{\binom{n}{2}} p^6(1-p)^2\bigl((1-p)^{n-3}(1+p-p^2)^{n-5} - (1-p^2)^{2n-6}\bigr) && (4.20)\\
&\quad+ \frac{12\binom{n-2}{3}}{\binom{n}{2}} p^6(1-p)^2(1-p^2)^{2n-9}\bigl(-2p+4p^2-3p^4+p^6\bigr) && (4.21)
\end{aligned}$$

$$+ \frac{3\binom{n-2}{3}}{\binom{n}{2}} p^6(1-p)^2(1-p^2)^{2n-10}\big(4p^3 - 7p^4 + 4p^6 - p^8\big) \tag{4.22}$$

$$+ \frac{12\binom{n-2}{4}}{\binom{n}{2}} p^6(1-p)^2(1-p^2)^{2n-10}\big(4p^3 - 7p^4 + 4p^6 - p^8\big). \tag{4.23}$$

Proof. Let $X_{i,j}$ be the indicator that there is an edge between vertices i and j and $V_i^{k,j} := X_{i,j}X_{i,k}$ be the indicator that there is a V-star on the vertices $\{i,j,k\}$ with elbow i. We easily find

$$Q_1(G) = \frac{p}{\binom{n}{2}} \sum_{\{j,k\}} \sum_{i \neq j,k} Y_i^{j,k},$$

where we define the indicator variables

$$Y_i^{j,k} = (1 - X_{j,k}) V_i^{j,k} \prod_{l \neq i,j,k} (1 - V_l^{j,k}).$$

From this point we note that the variance of $Q_1(G)$ is a sum of covariance terms times $p^2/\binom{n}{2}^2$. For fixed i, j, and k, there are $3\binom{n}{3}$ terms of the form $\operatorname{Cov}(Y_i^{j,k}, Y_u^{s,t})$, where we are including $\operatorname{Var}(Y_i^{j,k})$. In order to compute this sum, we will group these covariance terms with respect to the number of indices $Y_i^{j,k}$ and $Y_u^{s,t}$ share, which will yield the lemma after computing their covariances.

As an example of the type of calculation involved in computing these covariance terms, note that

$$\mathbb{E} Y_i^{j,k} = p^2(1-p)(1-p^2)^{2n-6},$$

so that

$$\operatorname{Var} Y_i^{j,k} = p^2(1-p)(1-p^2)^{2n-6}(1 - p^2(1-p)(1-p^2)^{2n-6}).$$

Furthermore, for $j \neq s$, we find that

$$\mathbb{E}\big\{Y_i^{j,k} Y_i^{s,k}\big\} = p^3(1-p)^2((1-p)^3 + 3p(1-p)^2 + p^2(1-p))^{n-4}.$$

Below we focus on carefully spelling out the number and types of covariance terms that contribute to the variance of $Q_1(G)$ and leave to the reader detailed calculations similar to those above.

If $\{i,j,k\} = \{u,s,t\}$ and $Y_i^{j,k} \neq Y_u^{s,t}$, then $\mathbb{E}\big\{Y_i^{j,k} Y_u^{s,t}\big\} = 0$, so the corresponding covariance term is negative, which we bound above by zero.

In the case that $Y_i^{j,k} = Y_u^{s,t}$, we obtain a variance term which corresponds to (4.17) in our bound.

Assume now that $\{i, j, k\}$ and $\{u, s, t\}$ have exactly two elements in common and consider which indices are equal. In the cases that $Y_u^{s,t}$ is equal to $Y_u^{j,k}$, $Y_j^{k,t}$, $Y_u^{i,k}$, $Y_u^{i,j}$ or $Y_k^{j,t}$, then $\mathbb{E}\{Y_i^{j,k} Y_u^{s,t}\} = 0$, so the corresponding covariance term is negative, which we bound above by zero. The two remaining cases to consider are $Y_u^{s,t} = Y_i^{s,k}$ which contribute $2(n-3)$ equal covariance terms leading to (4.18), and $Y_u^{s,t} = Y_j^{i,t}$ which also contribute $2(n-3)$ equal covariance terms leading to (4.19).

Assume $\{i, j, k\}$ and $\{u, s, t\}$ have exactly one element in common; we have four cases to consider. There are $2(n-3)(n-4)$ covariance terms of the basic form $Y_u^{s,t} = Y_u^{j,t}$ which leads to (4.20), there are $2(n-3)(n-4)$ covariance terms of the basic forms $Y_u^{s,t} = Y_u^{i,t}$ or $Y_u^{s,t} = Y_j^{s,t}$ which leads to (4.21), and there are $\binom{n-3}{2}$ terms of the form $Y_u^{s,t} = Y_i^{s,t}$ which yields (4.22).

Finally, if $\{i, j, k\}$ and $\{u, s, t\}$ are distinct sets, of which we have $3\binom{n-3}{3}$ ways of obtaining $Y_u^{s,t}$, the corresponding covariance terms contribute (4.23) to the bound. $\square$

Lemma 4.16. *Let (W, W') be the number of triangles in the exchangeable pair of Erdős-Rényi graphs (G, G') as defined above. If $Q_{-1}(G) = \mathbb{P}[W' =$*

$W-1|G]$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{Var} Q_{-1}(G) \leqslant{}& \frac{(n-2)}{\binom{n}{2}} p^3(1-p)^2(1-p^2)^{n-3}\big(1-p^3(1-p^2)^{n-3}\big)\\
&+\frac{2(n-2)}{\binom{n}{2}} p^3(1-p)^2\big((1-2p^2+p^3)^{n-3}-p^3(1-p^2)^{2n-6}\big)\\
&+\frac{4\binom{n-2}{2}}{\binom{n}{2}} p^5(1-p)^2\big((1-p)(1-2p+p^3)^{n-4}-p(1-p^2)^{2n-6}\big)\\
&+\frac{4\binom{n-2}{2}}{\binom{n}{2}} p^5(1-p)^2(1-p^2)^{2n-8}\big(1-p-p(1-p^2)^2\big)\\
&+\frac{12\binom{n-2}{3}}{\binom{n}{2}} p^6(1-p)^2\big((1-p)^3(1-2p+p^3)^{n-5}-(1-p^2)^{2n-6}\big)\\
&+\frac{12\binom{n-2}{3}}{\binom{n}{2}} p^6(1-p)^2(1-p^2)^{2n-9}\big((1-p)^2-(1-p^2)^3\big)\\
&+\frac{3\binom{n-2}{3}}{\binom{n}{2}} p^6(1-p)^2(1-p^2)^{2n-10}\big(4p^3-7p^4+4p^6-p^8\big)\\
&+\frac{12\binom{n-2}{4}}{\binom{n}{2}} p^6(1-p)^2(1-p^2)^{2n-10}\big(4p^3-7p^4+4p^6-p^8\big).
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. As in the proof of Lemma 4.15, let $X_{i,j}$ be the indicator that there is an edge between vertices i and j and $V_i^{k,j} := X_{i,j}X_{i,k}$ be the indicator that there is a V-star on the vertices $\{i,j,k\}$ with elbow i. We easily find

$$Q_{-1}(G) = \frac{(1-p)}{\binom{n}{2}} \sum_{\{j,k\}} \sum_{i\neq j,k} X_{j,k} V_i^{j,k} \prod_{l\neq i,j,k} (1-V_l^{j,k}),$$

and from this point, the proof is very similar to the proof of Lemma 4.15 ☐

We are now in the position to prove Lemma 4.14.

Proof of Lemma 4.14. Recall the notation of Lemmas 4.15 and 4.16. We have the following easy facts:

$$\begin{aligned}
(i)\ & \mathbb{E}W = \binom{n}{3}p^3,\\
(ii)\ & \sigma_n^2 = \operatorname{Var} W = \binom{n}{3}(p^3(1-p^3)+3(n-3)p^5(1-p)),\\
(iii)\ & q_1 = \mathbb{E}Q_1(G) = (n-2)p^3(1-p)(1-p^2)^{n-3}.
\end{aligned}$$

The first bound in (4.16) now follows from Theorem 3.6 after noting that for (W, W') the number of triangles in the exchangeable pair of Erdős-Rényi graphs (G, G') as defined above and $n^\alpha p \to c > 0$ for $1/2 \leqslant \alpha < 1$, then

$$\operatorname{Var} Q_1(G) = \mathrm{O}\big(p^5\big), \qquad \operatorname{Var} Q_{-1}(G) = \mathrm{O}\big(p^3/n\big),$$

which follows easily from Lemmas 4.15 and 4.16 above.

In order to prove the second bound in (4.16) we will apply Theorem 3.7 with $G = G(n,p)$ an Erdős-Rényi random graph, G' obtained by taking a step from G in the Markov chain (reversible with respect to the law of $G(n,p)$) defined previously, and G'' obtained as a step from G' in the same Markov chain. Setting (W, W', W'') to be the number of triangles in the graphs (G, G', G''), and defining (as per Theorem 3.7)

$$Q_{i,i}(G) = \mathbb{P}[W'' = W' + i, W' = W + i | G],$$

it is easy to see that

$$Q_{1,1}(G) = \frac{p^2}{\binom{n}{2}^2} \sum_{\{j,k\}} \sum_{i \neq j,k} Y_i^{j,k} \sum_{\{s,t\} \neq \{j,k\}} \sum_{u \neq s,t} Y_u^{s,t},$$

where as in the proof of Lemma 4.15 we define

$$Y_i^{j,k} = (1 - X_{j,k}) X_{i,j} X_{i,k} \prod_{l \neq i,j,k} (1 - X_{l,j} X_{l,k}).$$

From this point we find

$$\mathbb{E}\big|Q_{1,1}(G) - Q_1(G)^2\big| = \frac{p}{\binom{n}{2}} q_1,$$

since for fixed $\{j,k\}$, only one of the set $\{Y_i^{j,k}\}_{i=1}^n$ can be non-zero. A similar analysis shows

$$\mathbb{E}\big|Q_{-1,-1}(G) - Q_{-1}(G)^2\big| = \frac{1-p}{\binom{n}{2}} q_1,$$

and the second bound in (4.16) now follows from Theorem 3.7 after collecting the pertinent facts above. □

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are indebted to Steven Evans for pointing out that the inequalities we proved and used in an earlier version of the manuscript were in fact Landau-Kolmogorov inequalities. We also thank Peter Eichelsbacher for helpful discussions.

Both authors were partially supported by NUS research grant R-155-000-098-133 and NR would like to express his gratitude for the kind hospitality of the Department of Statistics and Applied Probability, NUS, during his research visit.

REFERENCES

A. D. Barbour (2009). Univariate approximations in the infinite occupancy scheme. *ALEA* **6**, 415—433.

A. D. Barbour, M. Karoński, and A. Ruciński (1989). A central limit theorem for decomposable random variables with applications to random graphs. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* **47**, 125–145.

M. Behrisch, A. Coja-Oghlan, and M. Kang (2010). The order of the giant component of random hypergraphs. *Random Structures Algorithms* **36**, 149–184. ISSN 1042-9832.

E. A. Bender, E. R. Canfield, and B. D. McKay (1997). The asymptotic number of labeled graphs with n vertices, q edges, and no isolated vertices. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory* **80**, 124–150.

S. Chatterjee (2007). Stein's method for concentration inequalities. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **138**, 305–321.

B. Davis and D. McDonald (1995). An elementary proof of the local central limit theorem. *J. Theoret. Probab.* **8**, 693–701.

P. Eichelsbacher and M. Löwe (2010). Stein's method for dependent random variables occurring in statistical mechanics. *Electron. J. Probab.* **15**, 962–988.

R. S. Ellis, C. M. Newman, and J. S. Rosen (1980). Limit theorems for sums of dependent random variables occurring in statistical mechanics. II. Conditioning, multiple phases, and metastability. *Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete* **51**, 153–169.

G. H. Hardy, E. Landau, and J.E. Littlewood (1935). Some inequalities satisfied by the integrals or derivatives of real or analytic functions. *Math. Z.* **39**, 677–695.

W. Kordecki (1990). Normal approximation and isolated vertices in random graphs. In *Random graphs '87 (Poznań, 1987)*, pages 131–139. Wiley, Chichester.

M. K. Kwong and A. Zettl (1992). *Norm inequalities for derivatives and differences*, volume 1536 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin. ISBN 3-540-56387-3.

L. Mattner and B. Roos (2007). A shorter proof of Kanter's Bessel function concentration bound. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **139**, 191–205.

D. R. McDonald (1979). On local limit theorem for integer valued random variables. *Teor. Veroyatnost. i Primenen.* **24**, 607–614.

M. D. Penrose and Y. Peres (2011). Local central limit theorems in stochastic geometry. *Electron. J. Probab.* **16**, 2509–2544.

M. D. Penrose and J. E. Yukich (2005). Normal approximation in geometric probability. In *Stein's method and applications*, volume 5 of *Lect.*

Notes Ser. Inst. Math. Sci. Natl. Univ. Singap., pages 37–58. Singapore Univ. Press, Singapore. doi: 10.1142/9789812567673_0003. Available at `http://dx.doi.org.libproxy1.nus.edu.sg/10.1142/9789812567673_0003`.

V. V. Petrov (1975). *Sums of independent random variables.* Springer-Verlag, New York. Translated from the Russian by A. A. Brown, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete, Band 82.

A. Röllin (2005). Approximation of sums of conditionally independent variables by the translated Poisson distribution. *Bernoulli* **11**, 1115–1128.

A. Ruciński (1988). When are small subgraphs of a random graph normally distributed? *Probab. Theory Related Fields.* **11**, 1–10.

V. E. Stepanov (1970). On the probability of connectedness of a random graph $\mathcal{G}_m(t)$. *Theory Probab. Appl.* **15**, 55–67.

M. Talagrand (2011). *Mean field models for spin glasses. Volume I.* Springer-Verlag, Berlin.